

Consumer Products Safe Testing Act which I recently introduced, along with thirty-two of our colleagues. This long-overdue legislation aims at scaling back outdated and burdensome federal regulations used by the FDA and other Federal agencies regarding toxicity testing of cosmetics, corrosives, and other substances. The bill calls on all Federal regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over toxicity testing to review and evaluate their regulations concerning animal acute toxicity testing. The bill establishes no new mandates regarding animal toxicity testing. For many years, the Federal Government has used animals to test the toxicity of consumer products. This bill seeks to establish, wherever possible, non-animal acute toxicity testing as an acceptable standard for Government regulations without compromising human safety.

Development of new technology has achieved substantial gains in the field of non-animal alternatives for acute toxicity tests. Many cosmetic companies, including Avon, Revlon, Redken, Paul Mitchell, The Body Shop, and Nexxus, already use alternatives to animal testing for screening and developing their products. In addition, many biotechnology firms are developing non-animal tests to determine the safety of various consumer products they produce. These tests include Skintex by InVitro International and Testskin by Organogenesis, Inc., which use human skin equivalent to measure irritancy. InVitro has actually developed a series of non-animal test kits which evaluate and rank irritancy and toxicity of a wide variety of substances.

Despite these advances, the Federal Government still relies on animals for toxicity testing. The result is that many companies at the cutting edge of non-animal technology are forced to market their products overseas. If the United States is to remain a world leader in biotechnology, we must reexamine our Federal regulations to reflect the advances in testing methods already in progress. If we fail to encourage developments in this field and continue using outdated federal regulations, we run the risk of falling behind the rest of the industrialized world and losing our position as a world leader in science. By calling on the Federal Government to reevaluate its regulations on toxicity testing to include non-animal tests wherever possible, the Consumer Products Safe Testing Act will encourage U.S. companies to develop and market non-animal testing products in the United States.

Non-animal alternatives to toxicity tests, in addition to being more humane, produce better data and reduce costs over the long term. Scientists agree that, despite the usefulness of animals for testing purposes, human cells and tissue produce more accurate results. As technology progresses to develop an acceptable battery of tests, non-animal toxicity testing can provide a more cost effective method of testing products. Savings can be realized from reduction in animal care and storage, in addition to time saved.

Time involved in product testing remains a crucial factor. Many product development companies spend large amounts of time and resources in the government regulatory process. Animal testing often takes several years to complete. If acceptable alternatives are developed, this would save the producer, as well as the regulatory agency, time and money during the lengthy and cumbersome approval process. In asking the Federal Government to

review its regulations concerning toxicity testing, the bill takes a bite out of federal regulation, while ensuring consumers' safety.

In recognition of the contribution animal tests make to the medical community, the bill specifically exempts all medical research. Only regulations regarding toxicity testing are affected.

I am delighted to sponsor the Consumer Products Safe Testing Act. This legislation will move towards ensuring that the Federal Government treats non-animal acute toxicity testing as an acceptable standard and that outdated and cumbersome regulations are reviewed and reevaluated.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION
159, CONSTITUTIONAL AMEND-
MENT RELATING TO TAXES

SPEECH OF

HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1996

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Americans understand the necessity of paying bills, balancing checkbooks, and living within their means. It is unfortunate that Americans must struggle to make ends meet, but their Government does not understand that concept.

The current Tax Code, with its high marginal rates and thousands of pages of rules, regulations, and redtape, poses a formidable barrier to economic growth. Tax reform must move toward making the Tax Code more user friendly and create incentives for savings and investment.

America's voters sent Washington a message in November 1994—just as Americans balance their budgets, so should the Government. This Congress has made fiscal responsibility the hallmark of our legislative agenda. We passed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, which included a tax reform package, but unfortunately, the President vetoed it.

Today, millions of Americans will pay the Federal Government their share of the tax cut that the Republican Congress promised, then passed, and that the President promised, then vetoed. The Congress passed this tax cut because we believe the people who earn the money should keep more of what they earn, so they can do more for themselves, their children, their churches, and their communities.

For too long, Congress denied its responsibility by using tax increases to cover up its own lack of political will to make tough budgetary decisions. Because Federal benefits tend to be targeted at specific groups, special interest groups consistently come together to effectively lobby for more spending. Taxes, on the other hand, are spread among many millions of working Americans who don't hire Washington lobbyists.

Limiting the ability of Congress to raise taxes will force Congress to set real budget priorities. To safeguard our children and grandchildren from a return to the profligate ways of the past, of tax and spend, and spend and tax, we must enact a tax limitation amendment that ensures congressional accountability for the taxpayers' money.

My home State of Oklahoma has had a tax limitation on its books since 1922. It also has

a balanced budget law. In Oklahoma any new tax must be submitted to a vote of the people of the State unless the tax receives a three-fourths supermajority of both the State house and the State senate. I wonder how many new taxes or tax increases would pass if they required a two-thirds supermajority or were submitted to a vote of the American people?

THE "WE THE PEOPLE" PROGRAM

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1996

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on April 27–29, 1996, more than 1,300 students from 50 States and the District of Columbia will be in Washington, DC, to compete in the national finals of the "We the People . . . the Citizen and the Constitution" Program. I am proud to announce that the class from Lawrence Central High School in Indianapolis, IN, will represent Indiana's Sixth Congressional District. These young scholars have worked diligently to reach the national finals by winning local competitions in their home State.

The distinguished members of the team representing Indiana are: Amber Anderson, Carrie Anderson, Heather Bailey, Alicia Crichton, Nathan Criswell, Finda Fallah, Jeremy Freismuth, Lourie Gilbert, Robert Gordon, Phillip Gray, Amanda Gross, Tim Halligan, Lindsey Hamilton, Brandon Hart, Scott King, Brent Patterson, Mike Petro, Megan Pratt, Jason Roberts, Anthony Roque, C. David Smith, Tony Snider, Tomeka Stansberry, Crystal Sullivan, Sarah Thompson, Gene Wagner, Maurice Williams, and Mike Zabst.

I would also like to recognize their teacher, Drew Horvath, who deserves much of the credit for the success of the team. The district coordinator, Langdon Healy, and the State coordinator, Robert Leming, also contributed a significant amount of time and effort to help the team reach the national finals.

The "We the People . . . the Citizen and the Constitution" Program is the most extensive educational program in the country developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The 3-day national competition simulates a congressional hearing in which students' oral presentations are judged on the basis of their knowledge of constitutional principles and their ability to apply them to historical and contemporary issues.

Administered by the Center for Civic Education, the "We the People . . ." Program, now in its ninth academic year, has reached more than 70,400 teachers, and 22,600,000 students nationwide at the upper elementary, middle, and high school levels. Members of Congress and their staff enhance the program by discussing current constitutional issues with students and teachers.

The "We the People . . ." Program provides an excellent opportunity for students to gain an informed perspective on the significance of the U.S. Constitution and its place in our history and our lives. I wish these students the best of luck in the national finals and look forward to their continued success in the years ahead.